

A. Background Information on the 1997 Category III Process

Proposal Evaluation and Selection Process-- Overview

Described below is a brief overview of the evaluation and selection process for the Category III proposals. Additional background information is provided in the Category III RFP. The proposal evaluation and selection process includes two types of panels: the Integration Panel and the Technical Review Panels (TRPs). The Integration Panel members are identified in Attachment B. The role of the Integration Panel is to determine the recommended set of proposals for funding, using various considerations some of which are described in Attachment

C. (Attachments B & C not included with instructions)

The role of the TRPs is to evaluate and score each of the proposals on its effectiveness and ability to achieve its stated goals. The TRPs' evaluation of proposals will be forwarded to the Integration Panel, for their deliberation in proposing the recommended package of projects to be funded by Category III.

To assist the Integration Panel in its deliberations, representatives of each of the TRPs will be asked to attend certain Integration Panel meetings. It is also expected that prior to the Integration Panel meetings those representatives would need to meet to discuss the integration of the proposal between TRPs on a geographic basis. CALFED will provide additional information on this portion of the process at the time of the TRP meetings.

The Integration Panel's recommended package of proposals will be presented to the Ecosystem Roundtable and BDAC for comment and input in October and November respectively. The presentation will include a summary description of the selected package of proposals without identifying the particular proposals, due to contract law requirements. The recommended package will then be presented to the CALFED Policy Group and the Secretary of Resources in November for a final funding decision.

Technical Review Panel Process

To manage the large number of proposals (332), thirteen TRPs have been formed based on commonality in subject material. The list of the thirteen TRPs are shown in Attachment D. Some panel subjects are very focused (e.g., Structures), while others have more breadth (e.g. Biological Research, Evaluation and Monitoring). Each panel consists of 5 to 8 panel members, as needed to cover the subjects within the particular panel.

B. General Instructions for Evaluating and Scoring Proposals

As part of this mailing, you have been provided with a copy of each of the proposals assigned to your particular TRP. Your assignment is to review each of the proposals in preparation for meeting with the other members of your TRP. Through your individual review, we ask that you score and indicate strengths, weaknesses and related issues for each of the criterion for each proposal. At the panel meeting, you will share each other's evaluations toward the development of a consensus-based assessment for each proposal, using the collective knowledge and perspective of the entire panel. *It is essential that you evaluate and score all of the proposals in advance of that meeting to ensure an effective dialogue.* Copies of the Proposal Assessment Form have been provided herein (Attachment E) for your use as working notes prior to the panel meeting. We are providing at least 7 days for you to review all of the proposals assigned to your panel before you meet with your fellow panel members.

The basis for evaluation comments and scores is the material presented in the proposal and the knowledge of the reviewers. Due primarily to workload and timing issues, interviews will not be part of the TRP process. If information is lacking or of concern, indicate the nature of the concerns on the evaluation sheet.

SPECIAL NOTE: During the evaluation process, all proposal content and evaluation comments are confidential. After the final decision by the Secretary, however, final evaluation forms and the proposals become public information. Accordingly, do not copy nor share contents of these proposals with anyone other than members of your own panel and/or CALFED Category III staff. If questions and comments regarding information about proposals are directed to you, either during or after the process, we recommend that you redirect the person asking the question or offering the comment/information to CALFED Category III staff.

C. Proposal Assessment Form--Instructions

The Proposal Assessment Form consists of three sections:

- Proposal Description
- Evaluation and Scoring (using the seven criteria)
- Additional proposal characteristics

The following information is provided to assist in preparing written comments and determining scores in order to fill out the Proposal Assessment Form.

1. Proposal Description.

In addition to the proposal number and title, the proposal should be described according to the following three items.

Regional Watershed Basin: Indicate the primary watershed basins in which the proposed project would be implemented in and provide benefits to. If the proposed project is equally applicable to all regions, please indicate. (To be filled out at the TRP meeting--map define regional boundaries will be provided at the meeting.)

Priority Species, Habitat, and Stressor: Indicate the species, habitats and stressors which are the main focus of the proposed project. The indicated species and habitats must be one of the RFP priority species or habitats presented Attachment F. The stressor(s) indicated in the proposal should conform with the RFP stressor terms identified in Attachment G. Additional information is provided in the RFP.

Primary Biological Objective: Briefly indicate the panel's assessment of the primary ecological/biological objective of the proposed project. For example: Reduce entrainment of outmigrating salmonid smolts during months of May to August; Provide meander corridor to improve diversity of habitat for enhanced salmonid outmigration and rearing.

2. **Evaluation and Scoring**

Each proposal should be evaluated and scored based on the following seven criteria as identified in the RFP:

- 1) Ecological / Biological Benefits
- 2) Applicant Ability: Capabilities, experience, and record of past performance, as well as experience and qualifications of key personnel.
- 3) Technical Feasibility and Timing
- 4) Cost sharing and local involvement
- 5) Compatibility with and Benefits to non-ecosystem CALFED objectives
- 6) Cost
- 7) Monitoring, Assessment, and Reporting

Evaluation comments are needed for each of the seven criteria as well as an overall proposal assessment. Evaluation comments are intended to be brief, bulleted statements of the proposal's significant strengths, weaknesses and open issues.

Scores are also needed for each individual criterion. Scores will range from 0 to 10, with 10 being a higher, more favorable score. The TRP should try to use the full range of points to score proposals in order to provide guidance to the Integration Panel in selecting proposals for funding. The overall proposal score is the sum of the scores for the individual criterion, thus a maximum of 70 points is possible.

The proposal evaluation comments and scores are to be collectively determined through discussion during the assessment meeting. The goal is a consensus evaluation. However, if consensus cannot be reached during the discussion on a particular criterion for a proposal, note the nature of the disagreement as part of evaluation comments and indicate an asterisk adjacent to the majority opinion score for the criterion.

For each of the seven criteria below we have provided “comment guidelines” and “scoring guidelines”. The comment guidelines are considerations for the TRP to use in evaluating the proposal and preparing written comments describing the proposal. Not all questions listed in the comment guidelines will apply to every proposal. The comment guidelines include the questions listed on pgs 9 -11 of the RFP. We have also provided questions in the bullets below each of the RFP questions which provide clarification and additional detail supporting the primary RFP question. The scoring guidelines are the factors to be used in scoring a proposal.

Evaluation and Scoring Criteria

1) Ecological/Biological Benefits:

(If proposal receives a score of zero it is eliminated for further evaluation)

Comment Guidelines

What is the ecological and biological effectiveness of the proposal in addressing a stressor and benefiting priority species or habitats?

- What is the timing and frequency of the benefits (eg annual, long-term, immediate)?
- Are the benefits and approaches consistent with existing recovery plans.
- Are other species positively or negatively impacted?
- Does the proposal address an area of scientific uncertainty regarding protection or restoration of priority species and habitats?
- What is the basis provided for the benefits attributed to the proposal?

Are there multiple benefits to species, habitats or natural processes? Are multiple stressors addressed?

To what extent does the proposal use natural processes and functions as a means of restoration?

Is the proposal expected to provide long-term ecological/biological benefits?

Scoring guidelines

Higher scores for more benefit.

Higher scores for multiple species/habitat benefits and multiple stressors.

Higher scores for long-term benefits.

Higher scores for approaches using natural processes and functions.

2) Applicant Ability:

(If proposal receives a score of zero it is eliminated for further evaluation)

Comment Guidelines

Does the applicant's experience, education, or background indicate that he/she is capable of implementing the proposal?

- What are the technical qualifications of the applicant and associated team?
- What is the nature and demonstrated level of field experience of the applicant and associated team members?
- What are the project management qualifications of the applicant?
- Is the applicant aware of issues and ongoing activities related to the project and its implementation?
- Does the applicant demonstrate a knowledge/understanding of the issue(s)?

If the applicant has received grants or contracts previously, what is the applicant's past record of performance in meeting the objectives and conditions of those grants or contracts?

Scoring guidelines

Higher scores for demonstrated technical knowledge.

Higher scores for demonstrated technical experience.

Higher scores for demonstrated project management capabilities and experience.

3) Technical Feasibility and Timing:

(If proposal receives a score of zero it is eliminated for further evaluation)

Comment Guidelines

Is the proposal sound in its technical approach, including but not limited to hydrological modeling where appropriate?

- Does the proposal have a sound, organized technical and programmatic plan?
- What is the effectiveness of the proposed approach in achieving the proposed benefit(s)?
- Is the solution appropriately innovative yet thoroughly assessed for benefits and risks?
- What is the documented technical basis and references for the project?
- Does the proposal plan allow flexibility to respond to new information?

Have all reasonable options been evaluated?

Does the proposal demonstrate an understanding of the problems?

Is the proposal ready to be funded or are there actions that the applicant is planning to complete prior to funding?

- If funding is requested for construction, have all required permits and design work been completed or is it expected to be completed in time to avoid delays?
- Are the necessary supporting actions in place (modeling, data evaluation, permitting, environmental compliance, etc)?
- What is the status of permits, easements, encumbrances, environmental compliance and any legal requirements?
- Are potential show-stoppers to implementation identified, and are they significant?
- What is the time frame for completion? Is it adequate/appropriate?
- Does success of the proposal depend on another project(s)/proposal(s)?

Scoring Guidelines

Higher scores for sound, organized technical and programmatic plans, including consideration of other options/alternatives..

Higher scores for demonstrated knowledge and innovativeness in the problem and solution.

Higher scores for projects that are ready-to-go with no potential obstacles to proceeding.

4) Cost Sharing and Local Involvement:

Comment Guidelines

Is the applicant sharing in the cost of the project?

Are other entities sharing in the cost of the project?

- Are proposal beneficiaries sharing in the cost of the proposal?

Does the proposal leverage other funding sources to support this or other restoration actions?

When in-kind services are proposed for cost sharing, does the proposal include a method of documenting in-kind services?

Is the proposal coordinated with other restoration programs and projects in the area?

Is there local support or involvement for the proposal?

- What local entities have been involved in the development of the project?

Is the proposal supported by a local watershed management plan?

Is there a plan for public notification / outreach which informs local landowners in the area of the proposed project? If the proposal is for a site-specific acquisition or restoration project, have the adjacent landowners been notified of the proposal and if not what is the plan for notifying adjacent landowners?

- What are the planned activities to gain/enhance local involvement?

Does the project have potential for significant local benefits or impacts including activities related to flood control, water diversions, local economy, and/or local landowners?

Scoring Guidelines

Higher scores for identified cost share.
 Higher scores for committed cost share.
 Higher scores for projects developed with local support.
 Higher scores for projects that include continued local involvement.

5. Compatibility with and benefits to CALFED non-ecosystem objectives: (See Attachment H)

Comment Guidelines

Does the proposal have multiple benefits related to the other CALFED objectives?

Are there conflicts with other CALFED objectives?

Does the project have the potential for significant adverse or beneficial impacts to third parties?

Scoring Guidelines

Higher scores to proposals which are compatible with CALFED non-ecosystem objectives
 Higher scores to proposals which provide significant benefits to CALFED non-ecosystem objectives

6) Cost:

Comment Guidelines

How does the cost of the proposal (including direct and indirect costs) compare to other similar proposals?

- Are technical/management resources adequate and available to support the project?
- Are there any negative and/or positive impacts on individuals or entities?

Is the level of funding requested for the proposed activity reasonable?

- How does applicant plan to use its' resources to maximize cost effectiveness, such as labor, equipment, class of staff used for different items, supplies?

- If subcontracts are not competitively bid, is there a reasonable justification for not competitively bidding?
- Are costs based on reasonable and current data?
- Is funding defined for discrete phases?
- Is there contingency reserves and/or plans for overruns or loss of cost share?
- Who is liable for consequences of catastrophic events, accidents, etc?

Does the proposal include overhead costs? If so are they reasonable?

How will operations and maintenance costs, if any, be funded?

- Who is responsible for future year O&M.

Scoring Guidelines

Higher scores for proposals which, overall, have lower reasonable costs, (consider only the costs associated with the amount requested from Category III rather than the total proposal cost).

7) Monitoring, Assessment and Reporting:

Comment Guidelines

Does the proposal provide adequate details and resources for both biological and financial monitoring and reporting?

- What are the identified monitoring, assessment and reporting elements?
- Are adequate and reasonable resources provided for monitoring, assessment and reporting, across time and various project tasks?
- What are the proposed technical and financial report deliverables, and are they reasonable?
- Do the deliverables include data transmission in electronic format?
- Is the data format consistent with standard data bases and formats?

Is the biological/ ecological monitoring component of the proposal coordinated with existing and /or anticipated monitoring programs?

Does the proposal have performance measures and indicators to determine biological/ecological success?

- Are the performance measures and indicators measurable?
- Does the proposed project use peer review?

Does the proposal include a discussion to compare the proposed methodology with alternatives to support its approach?

Scoring Guidelines

Higher scores for proposals with an identified and complete monitoring, assessment and reporting approach.

Higher scores for proposals with identified and measurable indicators of success.

Higher scores for monitoring, assessment and reporting approaches which is shared and coordinated with other programs/projects.

General/ Overall Comments on the Proposal:

Summarize comments and provide overall comments in this section. For example:

- What are the most significant strengths and weaknesses of the proposal and the proposed project?
- Are there any significant caveats appropriate to a funding decision (e.g. site visit, verification of status of the project or related projects, verification of qualifications, collaboration with another project, etc.)
- Are there any significant contract terms that need to be identified?
- Is funding from another source more appropriate?

TRP Recommended Scope of Funding: Can the proposal be divided into discrete segments/phases? If so, does the TRP recommend funding all or portions of the proposal. If only portions, provide the reasons for the partial recommended funding.

3. Additional Proposal Characteristics

This section of the Proposal Assessment Form provides additional information of interest to the Integration Panel. Described below are certain of the questions we believed needed additional definition beyond what is provided on the form.

What is the nature of the proposal: Provided below are definitions for each of the terms for this section.

Implementation: Including demonstration research that also provides a direct benefit to species/habitats. Project specific monitoring is included here. Planning: This includes feasibility studies, watershed planning and environmental documentation. Monitoring: This includes monitoring at a "landscape" level. Research: Focused research addressing areas of scientific uncertainty as needed to develop future implementation actions. Education: This includes proposals to increase public awareness and to influence subsequent practices that could provide benefit to the Bay-Delta ecosystem. Operations and Maintenance: self-explanatory.

Thank you for your patience and cooperation!

Panel _____

Proposal Assessment Form
Bay-Delta and Central Valley Restoration
1997 CALFED Category III

1. Proposal Description

Proposal Number/Title _____
Regional Watershed Basin _____
Priority Species, Habitats and Stressors _____
Primary Biological Objective _____

2. Evaluation and Scoring (Provide written comments regarding proposal strengths, weaknesses, open issues and associated score)

Ecological/Biological Benefits (Score _____)

Applicant's Ability (Score _____)

Technical Feasibility and Timing (Score _____)

Cost Sharing and Local Involvement (Score _____)

Compatibility and benefits to non-ecosystem CALFED Objectives (Score _____)

Cost (Score_____)

Monitoring, Assessment and Reporting (Score_____)

General /Overall Comments on Proposal (Sum of Above Scores_____)

Recommended Scope for funding:

Amount_____

Reason for not funding or limiting funding:

3. Additional Comments and Assessments (circle one or fill in blanks)

Nature of Proposal - Protection / Enhancement / Restoration / Creation

- Implementation / Planning / Monitoring / Research / Education / O&M

Amount of recommended funding applicable to : Education\$ _____ O&M\$ _____

Certainty of ecological/biological benefit - High / Moderate / Low

Nature of Benefits - Reduce Direct Mortality / Habitat and Natural Process Enhancement / Indirect Benefit / Other _____

Timing of Achieving Benefits - Immediate (1-3 yrs) / Moderate (4-8 yrs) / Long-term (>9 yrs)

Is there an existing legal obligation to perform the work associated with the proposal? If so, state the nature of the obligation. _____

Is the proposal a time-sensitive opportunity? If so, state the nature of the time-sensitivity _____